

**Minutes of the Faculty PhD Committee meeting on 2 June 2026 kl. 09.00  
- 11.00 in FKF meeting room (Ø10-412-2)**

Participants: Head of the PhD School Barbara Guerra, Professor Frank Kjeldsen (chair), Associate Professor Erik D. Hedegård, Associate Professor Melih Kandemir, Associate Professor Kasper Reitzel, PhD student Aylin Seren Güler, PhD student Nicolai D. K. Truong, PhD student Amanda F. Smith (substitute), PhD student Mats Jacobsen (substitute) and Vice Head of the PhD School Suba S. Lindholm (minute taker).

Absence: PhD student Alexander L. O. Degner and PhD student Sebastian Bak Jakobsen.

**Agenda**

**1. Approval of the agenda**

**Minutes:** The agenda was approved without comments.

**2. Follow-up on the meeting regarding proposed recommendations to the PhD Order**

**Minutes:** The Chair gave a summary of the previous meeting and the recommendations made. The Dean will discuss the committee's recommendations with the management group, after which the recommendations will be forwarded to DFIR.

Two of the submitted items, mandatory supervisor training and well-being/psychosocial working environment, were not part of the PhD order and were therefore postponed to this PhD committee meeting.

The Faculty supervisor course is mandatory for new academic staff, whereas HR's course is only recommended. The possibility of additional course offerings (e.g. CBS group leader course, as practiced at BMB) was mentioned.

The committee decided that no further action was required on this item.

The committee discussed whether well-being should be included in guidelines rather than in the order, for example as a separate section with references to departments, union representatives, etc.

**Follow-up:**

The PhD School will formulate a section in the current guidelines on well-being and psychosocial working environment, to be sent for written approval by the PhD committee.

**3. Survey in connection with the international evaluation**

**Minutes:** The PhD School has prepared questionnaires for PhD students and supervisors in connection with the upcoming international evaluation.

The committee had a few comments, which will be incorporated.

It was suggested to rephrase the questions to better support an evaluative (“assess”) approach.

The committee also pointed out that supervisors should be informed that PhD students have received the survey, so that they can encourage students to respond. Committee members will also encourage colleagues to respond to ensure a high response rate and representative data.

**Follow-up:**

The PhD School will adjust the questionnaire and distribute it in August.

**4. Mentor programme with the industry for PhD students**

**Minutes:** The proposal for a mentor programme was discussed based on the need for strengthened career guidance and collaboration with industry.

The committee was generally positive towards the initiative.

The timing of the mentoring scheme during the PhD programme was discussed. It was agreed that PhD students in a 5+3 programme should have the opportunity for a mentor during their second year, and 4+4 PhD students during their third year.

The committee suggested that if students are invited to visit the mentor’s company, any related expenses should be covered by the faculty.

The possibility that SDU RIO could contribute to establishing a pool of mentors from industry was discussed. The committee also expressed concern about resource use if the programme is anchored in the PhD School.

**Follow-up:**

The PhD School will prepare a draft statement for the management group, to be approved by the PhD School Head and Chair.

## **5. Guidelines for exemptions from the mandatory teaching course module 1 & 2**

**Minutes:** The PhD School receives repeated requests for exemption from the mandatory teaching course, particularly from IMADA, which has a mandatory TA course.

The Chair noted that the TA course description is difficult to assess in terms of equivalence with the mandatory teaching course.

The committee agreed that the TA course does not qualify for exemption. Previous teaching experience cannot serve as a basis for exemption either, as it is difficult to assess and document. The only exception is if a student can document completion of an equivalent course that can be credited.

PhD students at the faculty are already taking the mandatory teaching courses, which the committee will evaluate at the November meeting.

### **Follow-up:**

The PhD School will contact SDUUP to obtain evaluation material.

## **6. Student-driven PhD courses**

**Minutes:** Nicolai introduced the item based on experiences from IMADA and inspiration from CBS and asked whether the committee had experience with student-driven PhD courses.

The committee highlighted the resource demands related to establishing and maintaining such courses. The working hours required must be agreed upon and approved by the relevant head of department.

It was noted that ISA (Individual Study Activity) and study groups can be considered equivalent to student-driven courses. It is important that any activity awarding ECTS includes a clear evaluation method. For study groups, this could be a written assignment describing the learning outcomes.

The committee agreed that such activities must have an assigned academic staff member (VIP) responsible and may account for a maximum of 10 ECTS.

## **7. Course applications approved by the department's PhD study boards**

### **Minutes:**

The PhD Committee took note of the cases.

## **8. News from the Head of the PhD School/PhD School**

**Minutes:** Barbara (PhD School Head) gave a summary of the report. An increasing number of postdocs was highlighted as a potential challenge. It

was noted that reasons behind the numbers are unclear and require further analysis.

The committee took note of the report.

## **9. Any other business**

**Minutes:** Frank had requested a follow-up on the work related to the VIVE report.

Suba, as secretary of the Diversity and Equality Committee, explained that based on the report the committee recommended three initiatives to the management group:

- Establishment of a “resource person” function in connection with harassment (handled by Suba)
- Development of a faculty procedure for handling and reporting harassment (in dialogue with health and safety representatives)
- Introduction of bystander training to be rolled out to all faculty staff (in collaboration with GET)

**The meeting ended at kl. 10.58.**